

MASSWILDLIFE HABITAT MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM (MHMGP)

FY2021 RANKING CRITERIA WORKSHEET

PROJECT TITLE:

☐ Private Landowner

☐ Land Trust/NGO

☐ Municipal

	CRITERIA	RANK
1	Project site protection status	
2	Project map	
3	Project budget	
4	Net benefit of habitat enhancement activities to game species	
5	Net benefit of habitat enhancement activities to State Wildlife Action Plan species	
6	Appropriateness of Treatment Unit / project size	
7	Landscape context	
8	Project feasibility	
9	Recreational activities open to public	
10	Partnerships and outreach	
11	Climate change adaption	
	Total	

MHMGP RANKING CRITERIA (TOTAL 185 POINTS)

- 1) MHMGP Management Area's protection status:
 - Conservation restriction, Town Conservation Land, or other permanent conservation status under Article XCVII = **15** points
 - Agricultural Protection Restriction or private conservation organization ownership/restriction lacking Article XCVII protection = **10** points
 - Chapter 61/61A or 61B = **5** points
 - Other temporary protection including previous LIP covenant = **2** points
 - No protection = **ineligible for program**
- 2) Application map(s) is detailed showing the location of the parcel and identifies MHMGP Treatment Unit area(s) ("TUs") that correspond to the TUs described in the application. Maps are provided at the appropriate scale for the TUs and show the context of the site within the landscape:
 - Excellent: Maps have detailed locus and clearly outline MHMGP TUs; included maps are appropriately scaled, have detailed legends, and clearly delineate *both* the TUs and the entire parcel. Management access routes into TUs are shown, and the location of the property within the town(s) is clearly and accurately shown = **10** points
 - Satisfactory: Able to determine the location of the project, but map(s) lack some details relative to scale, legend, and/or management access routes. = **5** points
 - Insufficient: Unable to determine the location of the project. = **0** points
- 3) The proposed budget is detailed, itemized, reasonable for the services provided; quotes provided for sub-contracted work; shows the cost and explanation of the work needed to achieve project goals:
 - Detailed and itemized; quotes are included for sub-contracted work and costs are reasonable for proposed work. If NRCS rates are used, sufficient detail of the Treatment Unit habitat type(s) are provided, the work that is to be done is clearly specified, and the correct NRCS rate is selected. = **10** points
 - Satisfactory, lacking detail and/or quotes (if needed) are not provided, but budget is reasonable for proposed work. If NRCS rates are used, not enough detail is provided to determine if correct rate(s) are selected, or incorrect rate is chosen. = **5** points
 - Insufficient budget information or proposed budget is unreasonable for the scope and scale of the proposed work = **0** points (earning 0 points on this criteria may result in the rejection of the entire application as MassWildlife reserves the right to reject all proposals, or portions of proposals, that it determines do not provide the best value overall to achieve the goals of the program.)
- 4) Net benefit to game species from the proposed habitat enhancement project (the grant ranking committee will be the final arbiter of the species list that is evaluated in relation to this criterion):
 - Habitat enhancement provides high degree of net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, or trapped = **15** points

- Habitat enhancement provides moderate degree of net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, or trapped = **10** points
 - Habitat enhancement provides minimal net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, or trapped = **5** points
 - No net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, and trapped = **0** points
 - **Additional five (+5)** points for deer habitat enhancement (e.g. young forest creation) in [Wildlife Management Zones](#) 1, 5, 6, or northern section of zone 8 (zone 8 North of the Massachusetts Turnpike / Route 90).
 - **Additional ten (+10)** points for deer habitat enhancement in [Wildlife Management Zones](#) 2, 4N, and 4S.
- 5) Net benefit to non-game [State Wildlife Action Plan \(SWAP\)](#) species from the proposed habitat enhancement project. The grantee must provide an accurate list of SWAP species that will benefit from the proposed habitat enhancement activity (the species must occur in the vicinity of the TUs), and the species must benefit from the habitat type resulting from the proposed enhancement (the grant ranking committee will be the final arbiter of the species list that is evaluated in relation to this criterion):
- Habitat enhancement activities provides a high degree of net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list and applicant adequately described the direct connection between the habitat enhancement being conducted and the benefit to the identified species on the SWAP list = **15** points
 - Habitat enhancement activities provides a moderate degree of net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list and applicant adequately described the direct connection between the habitat enhancement being conducted and the benefit to the species on the SWAP list = **10** points
 - Habitat enhancement activities provides minimal net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list and applicant adequately described the direct connection between the habitat enhancement being conducted and the benefit to the identified species on the SWAP list = **5** points
 - Habitat enhancement activities provides no net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list, grantee fails to provide an accurate list of SWAP species that will benefit from the proposed habitat enhancement activity, applicant does not adequately describe the direct connection between the habitat enhancement being conducted and the identified species on the SWAP list, or the identified species do not occur in the area, or does not rely on the habitat type being enhanced = **0** points
 - **Additional five (+5)** points for projects that benefit Massachusetts Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern species as listed in 321 CMR 10.90.
- 6) Treatment Unit area(s) (“TUs”) are at the appropriate scale(s) for species/habitat management:
- TUs are at the appropriate size(s) for the species/habitat(s) being managed for = **20** points
 - TUs are partially appropriate for the species/habitat(s) being managed for = **10** points
 - TUs are not appropriate for the species/habitat(s) being managed for = **0** points

- 7) Geographic and ecological landscape context of the proposed Treatment Unit area(s). The proposed treatments are assessed relative to geological and ecological factors such as slope, aspect, soil type, adjacent land use types and interior forest habitat (the grant ranking committee will be the final arbiter of the landscape context that is evaluated in relation to this criterion)::
- TUs are highly complementary to local landscape features = **15** points
 - TUs are moderately complementary to local landscape features = **10** points
 - TUs are minimally complementary to local landscape = **5** points
 - TUs are not complementary to local landscape features = **0** points
- 8) Management objectives and tasks are likely to be achieved within the grant agreement period:
- Proposed management objectives and tasks are likely to be achieved within the grant agreement period and will meet stated habitat goals = **20** points
 - Proposed management objectives and tasks may be achievable within the grant period, and if achieved would meet stated habitat goals, but there may be limiting factors (weather, ecological, logistical or regulatory) that would prohibit the management from being completed within the grant period. Applicant has addressed the long-term plans for the TUs being managed in a way that may mitigate some of the limiting factors in their proposal. = **10** points
 - Proposed management objectives and tasks may be achievable within the grant period, but even if achieved may not fully meet stated habitat goals. There may be limiting factors (weather, ecological, logistical or regulatory) that would prohibit both the management tasks and goals from being completed within the grant period. Applicant has not fully addressed the long-term plans for the TUs being managed in a way that may mitigate some of the limiting factors in their proposal = **5** points
 - Proposed management objectives and tasks are unlikely to be achieved within the grant agreement period = **0** points
- 9) Land is open to the public for the following activities [If property is open to hunting by permission, the landowner must provide a detailed description of the access and permission application process – e.g. # of hunters allowed, type of hunting allowed, application form, etc. Failure to provide this information may result in no points for this criterion]:
- Land is open to hunting, fishing, and trapping without any landowner or municipality restrictions = **25** points
 - Land is open to a combination of hunting, fishing, and trapping with some restrictions: access to the property is limited due to landowner restrictions (permission is required; after review of criteria for permission, restrictions are considered low) = **20** points
 - Land is open to a combination of hunting, fishing, and trapping with some restrictions: access to the property is limited due to landowner restrictions (permission is required; after review of criteria for permission, restrictions are considered moderate) = **15** points
 - Land is open to a combination of hunting, fishing, and trapping with some restrictions: access to the property is limited due to landowner restrictions (permission is required; after review of criteria for permission, restrictions are considered high, or a fee is charged or membership is required for access) = **10** points

- Land is open to non-consumptive wildlife associated recreational activities and fishing (if fishing opportunities are present), but not hunting and/or trapping due to landowner's or municipality policy = **5** points
- Land is not open to the public, or fishing is not allowed (if fishing opportunities are present) = **0** points

Modifiers:

- **Subtraction of 5%** of awarded points for loss of 5-20% of parcel size available for hunting due to legally mandated setbacks under state statute M.G.L. c. 131, § 58
- **Subtraction of 15%** of awarded points for loss of 21-40% of parcel size available for hunting due to legally mandated setbacks under state statute M.G.L. c. 131, § 58
- **Subtraction of 25%** of awarded points for loss of 41%+ of parcel size available for hunting due to legally mandated setbacks under state statute M.G.L. c. 131, § 58

10) The landowner has established ongoing, written partnership agreements with other organizations and/or individuals in the habitat management process to further enhance *both* habitat management efforts and public awareness of habitat benefits. The landowner fully describes the nature of these partnerships in relation to *both* the development of the current proposal and achieving public awareness following completion of the proposal.

- The landowner has established written partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities described herein to *both* substantially enhance habitat management and public awareness of habitat benefits = **10** points
- The landowner has established written partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities described herein to moderately enhance *both* habitat management and public awareness of habitat benefits = **5** points
- The landowner has not established written partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities described herein that resulted in significant enhancement to the habitat management or to public awareness of habitat benefits = **0** points

11) In their proposal, the applicant described how restoration and management practices address climate change adaptation (e.g., how practices are adapted to more frequent flood and drought events, fewer days with frozen ground conditions, and increasing growing season length).

- The landowner fully described climate change adaptation in their proposal = **15** points
- The landowner partially described climate change adaptation in their proposal = **10** points
- The landowner minimally described climate change adaptation in their proposal = **5** points
- The landowner did address climate change adaptation in their proposal = **0** points